

## REMARKS

The foregoing Amendment and Remarks which follow are responsive to the Office Action mailed January 18, 2005 in relation to the above-identified patent application. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2 and 7-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by the Yee et al. reference. However, the Examiner also indicated that Claims 16-20 are allowed, and that Claims 3-6, 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this Amendment, Applicant has cancelled Claims 3-5 and 14, amended Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 11, 15 and 16, and added new Claims 21 and 22 into prosecution. More particularly, independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the features originally set forth in cancelled Claim 5, with Claim 6 being amended only to change its dependency to Claim 1. Due to Claim 5 only having been objected to by the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, as is Claim 6 as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Independent Claim 7 has been amended to correct various informalities therein. Applicant respectfully submits that the Section 102(a) rejection of independent Claim 7 as being anticipated by the Yee et al. reference should be withdrawn due to the complete absence of any teaching or suggestion in the Yee et al. reference regarding the inclusion of a groove in the first (top) surface of the chip pad, the groove being bottomed by a fourth surface and extending in a ring adjacent to peripheral sides of the chip pad. Indeed, in each embodiment of the leadframe disclosed in the Yee et al. reference, the top surface of the chip pad has a continuous, generally planar configuration. Claim 8 has been amended to make the language thereof consistent to that of amended Claim 7. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 7 is in condition for allowance, as are Claims 8-10 as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Independent Claim 11 has been amended to include the features originally set forth in cancelled Claim 14, with Claim 15 being amended only to change its dependency to Claim 11. Due to Claim 14 only having been objected to by the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 11 is in condition for allowance, as are Claims 12, 13 and 15 as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Application No.: 09/845,601  
Attorney Docket: AMKOR-040A

Independent Claim 16, which was allowed, has been amended only to correct various informalities therein.

New independent Claim 21 represents a combination of the features originally set forth in Claims 1, 5 and 6. Similarly, new independent Claim 22 represents a combination of the features originally set forth in Claims 11, 14 and 15. Since, as indicated above, Claims 5, 6, 14 and 15 have only been objected to by the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 21 and 22 are also in condition for allowance.

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the stated grounds of rejection have been overcome, and that Claims 1, 2, 6-13 and 15-22 are now in condition for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 19-4330.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/14/05

By:



Mark B. Garred  
Registration No. 34,823  
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER  
75 Enterprise, Suite 250  
Aliso Viejo, California 92656  
Telephone: (949) 855-1246  
Fax: (949) 855-6371